NEO-LATIN NEWS

Vol. 56, Nos. 1 & 2. Published jointly with SCN. Send inquiries to the editor, Craig Kallendorf, 4227 TAMU, College Station, Texas 77843-4227. NLN is the official publication of the American Association for Neo-Latin Studies and is edited by Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University; Western European Editor: Gilbert Tournoy, Leuven; Eastern European Editors: Jerzy Axer, Barbara Milewska-Wazbinska, and Katarzyna Tomaszuk, Centre for Studies in the Classical Tradition in Poland and East-Central Europe, University of Warsaw. Founding Editors: James R. Naiden, Southern Oregon University, and J. Max Patrick, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and Graduate School, New York University.

♦ *De arte excerpendi. Imparare a dimenticare nella modernità.* By Alberto Cevolini. Biblioteca dell'«Archivium Romanicum,» Serie I: Storia, Letteratura, Paleografia, 333. Florence: Leo S. Olschki, 2006. 458 pp. 45 euros. The subject of this book is the *ars excerpendi*, or the art of extracting information from one's reading and organizing that information in such a way that it can be reused to prepare new texts. In various forms this practice extends from antiquity (the *loci classici* are Pliny the Younger, *Epist.* 3.5.10-11, 6.20.5, and 9.36.6) into modern times (Hegel copied interesting extracts from his reading onto blank pages, which he preserved in alphabetical order according to the titles he added at the top of each page), but it flourished above all in the Renaissance. As Cevolini rightly argues, the printing press led to an explosion in knowledge that was accompanied by a corresponding difficulty in organizing and retaining what was read. Various solutions were devised, ranging from indexing books to preparing catalogues that grouped books according to interconnected subject headings to the development of encyclopedias and other general reference works. The *ars excerpendi* developed within this context, retaining firm roots in the rhetorical system from which it was born. Anyone who has looked at a large number of early printed books has noticed that many of them have passages that are underlined and key phrases

('indexing notes') in the margins. The information in these volumes has been prepared for transfer to a commonplace book, in which the reader copied the underlined passages under the rubrics written in the margins. Sometimes these commonplace books themselves were published, producing books with, for example, classical content reorganized according to Renaissance mental categories.

After explaining how all this works, Cevolini prints translations into Italian of all or part of several books on the subject: Francesco Sacchini (1570-1625), *De ratione libros cum profectu legendi libellus* (1613); Jeremias Drexel (1581-1638), *Aurifodina artium et scientiarum omnium* (1638); John Locke (1632-1704), *Méthode nouvelle de dresser des recueuils communiquée par l'auteur* (1686), later published posthumously in English as *A New Method of Making Commonplace-Books* (1706); Vincent Placcius (1642-1699), *De arte excerpendi* (1689); and Johann Jacob Moser (1701-1785), *Vortheile vor Canzleyverwandte und Gelehrte* (1773). Also translated in the same appendix is an article of Niklas Luhmann (1927-1998), "Kommunikation mit Zettelkästen. Ein Erfahrungsbericht" (1981). The primary sources are the usual suspects in this field: Drexel, Sacchini, and Placcius, for example, are discussed in an informative essay by Jean-Marc Chatelain, "Humanisme et culture de la note," in *Revue de la Bibliothèque nationale de France* 2 (1999): 26-36 (not mentioned in Cevolini's notes). It is, however, useful to have large chunks of this primary material readily to hand. One could argue that it would have been even more useful to have these chunks in the original languages, or at least in facing-page presentations that provide the original text along with translations, but this book is probably long enough already, and given that the relevant material is in French and German as well as Latin, the decision to translate is a reasonable one.

This book provides a very useful introduction to anyone who wants to know more about how knowledge was retained and reused in early modern times. The 137-page narrative is well annotated, with a larger percentage of non-Italian references than one often sees in Italian scholarship, and the bibliography contains three double-columned pages that list other books on the *ars excerpendi*. A surprising bonus is the list on pp. 141-43 of Italian translations of Latin technical terms in this area: readers at the Cambridge University Library, for example, need not be puzzled any longer at what the library's collection of *adversaria* contains, since Cevolini explains that they are "(estratti in forma di) annotazioni; quaderni di annotazioni" (141). Students of neo-

Latin will come away with a better understanding of how books were read during this period, along with why books like Orazio Toscanella's *Osservationi … sopra l'opere di Virgilio, per discoprire e insegnare à porre in prattica gli artifici importantissimi dell'arte poetica con gli essempi di Virgilio stesso* (Venice, 1567) are important (this is simply a printed commonplace book, the product of the *ars excerpendi*). The fundamental issue here, of how knowledge could be retained, organized, and reused in the post-print period, has attracted some very renowned scholars of late (e.g., Anthony Grafton, Roger Chartier), and Cevolini's book makes a useful contribution to this discussion. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Chrysis*. By Enea Silvio Piccolomini. Ed., trans., and com. by J.-L. Charlet. Paris: H. Champion, 2006. 149 pp. Enea Silvio Piccolomini (1405-1464) was undoubtedly one of the most important representatives of Italian humanism, both for his literary activity and for the promotion of culture carried out after his election to pontiff (1458) with the name of Pius the Second. Nevertheless, part of his production was considered by Piccolomini himself to be too licentious to be the work of a pope; therefore, as Pius the Second, he effected a kind of 'self-censorship' with which he somehow abjured his past as a writer, from which the famous sentence *Aeneam reïicite, Pium suscipite* was born. As a consequence of this 'refusal,' some works of Piccolomini have gone lost, while others have come to light only in the nineteenth century after decades of oblivion; among the latter we find the comedy *Chrysis*–written in 1444, probably in September–which Jean-Louis Charlet (henceforth C.) now furnishes with a new critical edition, with translation and commentary in French.

In the introduction (7-38), after a brief presentation of Piccolomini's rich personality and biography, C. dwells especially upon one of the main problems faced by research on *Chrysis*: whether this is a comedy intended for reading or for presentation? After a careful and deep discussion of the text's external and internal elements and of the different positions of the critics, the French scholar maintains that the play was probably recited by many actors (probably by Enea Silvio himself and his friends), rather than staged as we nowadays mean (24); the occasion of the recitation could have been the Nuremberg Diet in 1444, during which Piccolomini would have submitted to his friends and to some officials the roles to play. Nevertheless, C. sharply

moves the subject of the debate from the destination to the dramatic characterization of the comedy, remarking that the main point of the *quaestio* is the strong theatricality of the *pièce,* conceived by Piccolomini as a potentially presentable text; such formulation of the *Chrysis* derived to the author from his familiarity with the ancient Latin theater, particularly with the comedies of Plautus (24-26). As for its birth and literary significance, C. believes that we do not have to consider the *Chrysis* as the *lusus* of an amateur, conceived and composed to animate spare time during the Diet of Nuremberg, but rather as a work that holds a prominent position in the survey of humanistic Latin comedy, halfway between the first Latin *pièces,* still influenced by medieval novels and farces, and the Latin comedy of the end of the fifteenth century, inspired by philological and scenographical reflections on ancient theater. The closing pages of the introduction are devoted to the names of the characters, to the meter (with a precise analysis of the characteristics of the *Chrysis* that also keeps in mind some relationship with contemporary metrical theories and with Plautine metrics), to the principles of the edition, and to the rich bibliography.

The parallel text (48-93) has the merit of preserving the verve of the original without excessively sacrificing the Latin text; particularly effective is the effort to give to the French text a rhythm that corresponds as much as possible to that of the Latin verses. In the commentary (95-141) C. focuses his attention above all on the linguistic and formal aspects of the text, underlining the archaizing imprint conferred by Piccolomini, revealed by the frequent choice of lexical solutions typical of the language of Plautus and Terence. Since the *Chrysis* is a relatively short work (812 lines) with a single-codex tradition, we can commend C.'s choice to omit a 'conventional' critical apparatus and to place in the commentary the discussion of the main textual problems, as well as the grounds of the corrections (few, in truth) brought to the text. This book, which will surely be a useful tool for research on humanistic Latin comedy, concludes with an index of names and words (143-45) and another of sources and parallels to classical texts (147-49). (Claudio Buongiovanni, Università di Napoli "Federico II")

◆ *Patronage and Humanist Literature in the Age of the Jagiellons: Court and Career in the Writings of Rudolf Agricola Junior, Valentin Eck, and Leonard Cox*. By Jacqueline Glomski. Erasmus Studies, 16. Toronto, Buffalo, and London:

University of Toronto Press, 2007. xiv + 336 pp. $75. This book focuses on the intellectual climate at the Jagiellon court in Cracow during the period from 1510 to 1530. The dates are important because these were the years in which the characteristic forms of Renaissance culture took root at Cracow. And the place matters, too, for it is here that King Sigismund I transformed the world around him, starting in Cracow but spreading out from there, through the university and the printing presses of the city, then throughout the region east of Vienna.

Glomski's thesis, quite simply, is that this transformation reflects a localized version of the same patronage process that spread throughout the rest of Europe. The taste for a literature based on imitation of the classics began in this area at the end of the fifteenth century, when Filippo Buonaccorsi and Conrad Celtis passed through Cracow. It was established between 1510 and 1530 by a second wave of humanist activity that centered on three itinerant scholar-poets and their work at the University of Cracow: Rudolf Agricola Junior (*ca.* 1490-1521) and Valentin Eck (*ca.* 1494-1556?), both originally from southern Germany, and Leonard Cox (*ca.* 1495-*ca.*1549), an Englishman. This taste was advanced by humanists like these, who used their abilities as a way to advance their own positions among the rich and powerful. They could provide what the elite wanted: not philanthropy or knowledge for its own sake, but fame, disseminated through flattering verses composed in the newest style. The literature that resulted was the product of negotiation, as patron and client found ways to make their very different agendas coincide. Glomski begins her study by examining the writers' strategies for career-building. She then examines how Agricola Junior, Eck, and Cox used the panegyrical poetry they wrote to create the image of a great man, a "humanist hero." The public image of the Polish and Hungarian kings and ecclesiastical and lay dignitaries formed by Agricola Junior and Eck in their occasional and political poetry is examined, along with the poets' role in producing propaganda that furthered the political aims of their patrons and simultaneously advanced their own positions at court.

As Glomski notes, it is curious that there has been before now no effort to produce a synthetic study of these three men and that basic bibliograpical information and even modern biographies of Agricola Junior, Eck, and Cox have only appeared recently. As she notes, her project has come up against a basic methodological issue in neo-Latin studies: should the neo-

Latin literature printed in Cracow be considered part of the corpus of a national literature, or part of a supranational European literature in Latin that exists separately but on the same basis as the national literatures? If the former option is preferred, into which national literature should this material be placed? Polish, one might be tempted to say–but none of the writers was Polish by birth, all of them left Cracow and did much of their work elsewhere, and Poland in the sixteenth-century did not even include the same territory as it does now. Some of these same issues come up in the article on "Central-Eastern Europe" by Jerzy Axer, with the assistance of Katarzyna Tomaszuk, in *A Companion to the Classical Tradition*, ed. by C. W. Kallendorf (Oxford, 2007), 132-55. Axer and Tomaszuk argue that this region is a sort of "borderland" between western Europe, where the classical tradition had a more natural home, and Russia, which received it in effect only in the nineteenth century; as such, the appearance of the classics in central-eastern Europe must always be placed carefully against the intellectual, cultural, and political background of those who were working for its importation. This is what Glomski does. Her larger reliance on the patronage model in one sense confirms what we might expect, since as she herself admits, it is the same model that prevailed elsewhere in Europe as well (4), but this is an unusually interesting local variation on the usual theme. As the 2006 Budapest congress of the International Association for Neo-Latin Studies showed, a great deal of interesting work is going on in central-eastern Europe, but much of it remains inaccessible to scholars who do not read Hungarian, Polish, etc. Glomski is thoroughly at home in both the Latin writings of her subjects and the modern vernacular scholarship on them, making this book an excellent introduction to neo-Latin studies in the region it treats. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

♦ *Die Mutineis des Francesco Rococciolo: Ein lateinisches Epos der Renaissance.* Ed. by Thomas Haye. Noctes Neolatinae / Neo-Latin Texts and Studies, 6. Hildesheim, Zürich, New York: Georg Olms Verlag, 2006. 254 pp. 58 euros. The text printed here, almost unknown to modern scholarship, is the *editio princeps* of the epic poem *Mutineis*, by the Modenese poet Francesco Rococciolo. Rococciolo was born in the late 1460s or early 1470s in Modena and died there in 1528, producing in the last thirty-four years of his life a series of poems in various formats on the turbulent history of his native city. A few

of these works were published by his uncle, the Modenese printer Domenico Rococciola; the majority survive in manuscript only. The events described in the poem took place between 1510 and 1517, when Modena served as a political football for the Holy Roman Emperor, the Pope, the French king, and the local Italian nobles, with the poem being written (most probably) between 1517 and 1521. The *Mutineis* is essentially a poetic *laus urbis*, a panegyrical epic comparable in some ways to the *Historia Bononiensis* of Tommaso Seneca or the *Tarentina* of Paracleto Malvezzi. It presents to the reader a mixture that is typical of the Renaissance, including panegyrical portraits of famous people, pathos-infused contemporary history, folk wisdom with a Christian coloring, ancient history, and pagan myth. Virgil, Ovid, Lucan, Statius, and Claudian all provide intertextual reference points for Rococciolo.

The poem survives in three manuscripts–Modena, Biblioteca Estense, cod. lat. 661 (Alpha O. 9, 30) (=M); Turin, Biblioteca Nazionale, cod. G. VI. 46 (=T); and Bologna, Biblioteca Universitaria, cod. 1097 (=B)–with Modena, Biblioteca Estense, cod. lat. 265 (Alpha Q. 8, 30) suggesting that a fair copy, now lost, may well have passed into the possession of the Este family in Ferrara. Haye's edition is based on T, which represents the final authorized version of Rococciolo's text, but readings from M appear in an apparatus. M was a working draft of Rococciolo's, so that this apparatus allows the interested reader to follow the evolution of the *Mutineis* as it was revised by its author. This is an interesting editorial decision, one that could be followed profitably in the preparation of other editions if the appropriate evidence survives. There is no apparatus containing references to the classical texts referenced by Rococciolo; that is a pity. There is, however, a thorough index of proper names.

In his forward Haye suggests that the *Mutineis* offers four appeals to the modern reader: it paints portraits of a number of key political figures of the Renaissance, it represents a literary effort to stimulate the patriotism and communal sentiments of the citizens of Modena, it offers an exceptionally lively and realistic picture of life in the early sixteenth century, and it presents unusual insight through the surviving manuscript witnesses into the compositional process of a humanist epic. Readers will have to decide for themselves whether these appeals are enough to justify this edition. Haye has done his work competently, but at a certain point one has to wonder when circumstances have changed sufficiently to warrant overturning the judgement of the

centuries and printing a poem that has not been considered worth printing for five hundred years. Nevertheless for readers whose interest extends to the neo-Latin epic, the *Mutineis* merits a look. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *La recepción hispana de Juan Luis Vives*. By Valentín Moreno Galego. Valencia: Generalitat Valenciana, 2006. With CD-ROM. "Juan Luis Vives was lost to Spanish humanism, but this loss was more than offset by the European projection that his thought achieved thanks to exile," as Luis Gil Fernández has written. Sent from Valencia in his mid 'teens to study in Paris by his Jewish *converso* family (grievously afflicted over the years by the Inquisition), he thereafter began his lifelong association with the southern Netherlands and the world of northern humanism. After being invited to succeed to the chair of Antonio de Nibrija, 'father of Spanish humanism,' at Alcalá (*egregius ille senex planeque dignus*, as Erasmus wrote of him to Vives in 1520), he set out for Spain in May of 1523 (*Ego nulla ratione subtrahere me potui Hispanico itineri*, as he put it somewhat ambiguously to Erasmus) but got no further than London and Oxford. To Juan de Vergara, through whom the Alcalá invitation had come, he later wrote lamenting the dire shortage, as he saw it, of humanistic knowledge and endeavor in his homeland. Nevertheless, now, Dr. Valentín Moreno Gallego has been able to give us a magisterial 800-page study of *La recepción hispana de Juan Luis Vives,* a work already honored with the Premio Rivadeneyra de la Real Academia Española.

After a survey of Vives historiography from the start of the nineteenth century down to the present day (41-65), Dr. Moreno gives us two detailed chapters (67-133) on aspects of the response to Vives' works outside the Peninsula–especially in France and England–down to *ca.* 1800. The account of Vives' *Receptio Hispana* falls into three parts. The first, and by far the longest (chaps. 4-14), covers the period 1522-1620. Beginning with attitudes to the acquisition of literary fame, it goes on to examine Vives' part in the transmission of Greco-Latin authors; then disciples of his from Spain in the Low Countries in the 1520s, such as Honorato Juan, later tutor to Philip II's son Don Carlos, and Pedro de Maluenda, the future theologian at Trent; and finally, the circles of admirers at Toledo, Burgos, and Valencia. Subsequent chapters are centered on responses either to particular works by Vives (his commentaries on St. Augustine's *De civitate Dei*, his *De institutione feminae christianae*,

and *De subventione pauperum*) or to his treatment of the topics of historiography, rhetoric, grammar, and psychology. Dr. Moreno notes that, *malgrè tout*, it was in the reign of Philip II that Vives was most often cited in works of Spanish authors, those citations including Vives' commentaries on the *De civitate Dei* (placed, however, on the Expurgatory Index of 1584). Part II, covering the period 1620-1723, is chiefly focused on the response of the Spanish Jesuits to Vives, particularly as regards their use of his *Dialogues* in their teaching. Part III (1723-1817) deals, in four chapters, with the eighteenth-century recovery of a due sense of the stature and significance of Vives' work viewed as a whole, pre-eminently achieved through Gregorio Mayans, to whose long devotion to Vives we owe the posthumously published *Opera omnia* of Valencia (1782-1790), not intended as a critical edition but, more modestly, *ut editio sit correcta, et probabilis hominibus fastidiosis*. It bore witness, as Antonio Mestre Sanchis has stressed, to the enormous importance of the religious values of sixteenth-century Spanish humanists for the aspiration to religious reform entertained by the eighteenth-century Spanish Enlightenment.

Dr. Moreno's study rests on a massive foundation of primary and secondary sources. The 3,700 or so notes that remain of the nearly 6,000 (as he records) in his doctoral dissertation offer a bibliographical treasure-house of precise information and guidance that will be of the greatest value to students of Vives. A detailed inventory of manuscripts consulted is provided in the printed text. Beyond that, a CD-ROM reproduces the entire work and offers a comprehensive search facility. Dr. Moreno has not only made an outstanding contribution to Vives scholarship, but he has also put himself to much trouble to make his study a helpful *instrument de travail* to others. For all, and from all, he will receive his readers' very great gratitude. (R. W. Truman, Christ Church, Oxford)

◆ *De officio mariti*. By J. L. Vives. Ed. by C. Fantazzi. Selected Works of J. L. Vives, 8. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2006. The series bearing the title 'Selected Works of J. L. Vives' was conceived more than twenty years ago by an international team of scholars under the presidency of the late Constant Matheeussen of the Brussels Catholic University. It aimed primarily at producing a critical edition of the text of Vives' works, which until now have had to be read for the most part in the old, and often unreliable, *Opera omnia* provided by Gregorio Mayans (Valencia, 1782-1790). Now, some ten years

after the publication of *De institutione feminae christianae* by C. Fantazzi and C. Mattheeussen in two volumes (1996-1998), its pendant, the *De officio mariti*, has been brought out by C. Fantazzi.

At first glance this again seems to be a well presented volume of the highest quality. Even a somewhat cursory reading, however, reveals a number of troubling features. For this short review I shall restrict myself to the part of the introduction dealing with "Editions and Constitution of the Text" and to some random checks within the Latin text and notes.

On p. xix one finds two different editions represented by one single siglum (W^2): an edition by Robert Winter (Basel, 1540) and another by Joannes Oporinus (Basel, s.d.). There is no indication of the location of the copy of the Oporinus edition used by the editor, but a copy of the 1540 Basel edition of Robert Winter is said to be found at the "Biblioteca (sic) Universitatis Lovaniensis." This designation fails to acknowledge the splitting of the old University of Louvain into two entirely independent universities, each of them with its own library, neither of them being called "Biblioteca Universitatis Lovaniensis." Using the Latin name for a library would have been more appropriate in the case of the Royal Library at Brussels (same page), its official name being "Bibliotheca Regia." However, to use the Latin name for the library of the University of Leuven/Louvain only adds to the confusion. The fact is that this particular copy is kept in the Central Library of the University of Leuven, not of Louvain-la-Neuve. It has been described in the catalogue *Vives te Leuven*, ed. G. Tournoy, J. Roegiers, and C. Coppens (Leuven, 1993), pp. 115-19, nr. 33, where the correct signature is also given (CaaA844). The number "PR 278" is misleading and erroneous in that it relates back to the number "PK 278," which is only an administrative number indicating that this particular volume has been bought thanks to the private endowment of the university.

On the same p. xix the next edition listed is the *Opera* of Basel, 1555 (=B). Contrary to the information supplied here, where we read "Colophon: Basilae, per Nic. Episcopium Iuniorem anno MDLV vol II, pp. 595-647," the colophon at the end of the second volume reads "Basilae, apud Iacobum Parcum impensis Episcopij Iunioris, Anno salutis humanae MDLV mense Augusto."

Still on the same p. xix, among other editions not consulted by the editor, is quoted an edition from the press at "Hannover, Wechelianis 1614." It is in fact clear that this "Hannover" is an erroneous translation of the Latin

"Hanoviae," i.e., Hanau (in the neighborhood of Frankfurt am Main), where the heirs of the printer Andreas Wechel were active during the first two decades of the seventeenth century. There are two more typographical errors on this same page: lege *editio princeps* (not *princep*), and *Johannes Maire* (not *Maires*). A recent study on this important Leiden printer is by R. Breugelmans, *Fac et spera: Joannes Maire, Publisher, Printer and Bookseller in Leiden*, 1603-1657 (Houten, 2003).

I should like to finish this short review with a few remarks on the text and the notes. To begin with the notes, the interested reader would certainly have been more pleased if a reference was given for the information supplied. One example only: on p. 5 there is a short note explaining who Honorato Juan was. But one misses a reference here to so fundamental a work as Francisco Josè Sanchis Moreno, *Honorato Juan vida y recuerdo de un maestro de príncipes* (Valencia, 2002).

Some random checking of the text reveals that it is not always reliable. The very first lines of the Latin text in Fantazzi's edition read (2): *IOANNIS LODOVICI VIVIS AD ILLUSTRISS. D. IOANNEM BORGIAM, GANDIAE DUCEM, PRAEFATIO.* To start with, in the *editio princeps* (C), as well as in the three Basel editions of 1538, 1540, and 1555 (W, W^2, B), we read *Candiae*, not *Gandiae*. Furthermore the apparatus criticus states that somewhere in this title the words *in librum suum de officio mariti* are *added* in the *editio princeps* and in the 1540 Basel edition. In fact they are also present in the 1538 edition, and, what is more important still, there is no reason whatsoever why these words should be relegated to the apparatus criticus: they are neither a later addition by some editor or printer, nor a first version corrected afterward by the author.

On the same page 2, l. 24, instead of *Latina non intellexisset*, W, W^2, and B read *Latinam <viz. linguam> non intellexisset*, which is not mentioned in the apparatus criticus but seems to be the better reading (I did not check the *editio princeps*). On p. 6, l. 6, the reading *comitem* instead of *et comitem* appears not only in C and W^2, but also in W. On p. 6, l. 19, the three Basel editions read *insinuat se* instead of *insinuat,* probably presenting the better reading and anyhow one not mentioned in the apparatus criticus. On p. 8, l. 1, one reads *Ludovici,* not only in W^2, but also in WB, contrary to what is written in the apparatus criticus. On p. 98, ☞ 88, the text reads *iubemur esse bonus odos*, exactly the reading of the 1555 edition. The apparatus fontium, giving *bonos (sic) odos*, refers to "Vulg. 2

Cor. 2, 15," where one reads, however, *bonus odor*. The list of corrigenda at the end of vol. II of the 1555 edition offers the correct reading as well. On p. 124 ☞ 114 *ingenium* . . . *flectile*, the 1555 edition does not present the erroneous reading *flexile*, as is given in the apparatus criticus, but the correct reading *flectile*. On p. 140 ☞ 127 the name *Godolina* needs to be corrected to *Godoliva*, the name of the Flemish saint murdered by her husband, mentioned later by Vives as *Godeliva* in his twelfth dialogue (cf. the recent edition of Vives, *Los diálogos*, by M.ª Pilar García Ruiz (Pamplona, 2005), p. 230). On p. 182 ☞ 166, the source for the Candaules story is not "Hdt 1, 7, 1-13," but Hdt. I, 8-13. On p. 226, ☞☞ 208-9, the line numbering in the apparatus criticus is wrong: instead of "18, 24, 27," read 17, 23, 26.

Sadly, it seems likely from this evidence that a more extensive investigation would bring further cases to light. However those presented here are sufficient in themselves to cast at least some doubt on the character of this edition. It is a pity that, as it seems, it lacked the advantage of a second editor or the scrupulous involvement of a real editorial board. (Gilbert Tournoy, Catholic University of Leuven)

◆ *Thuanus: The Making of Jacques-Auguste de Thou (1553-1617)*. By Ingrid A. R. De Smet. Travaux d'Humanisme et Renaissance, 418. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2006. 348 pp. De Thou was a famous man in his own day: offspring of France's judicial elite who rose to the position of *Président à mortier* in the Parlement of Paris, a man whose house and library attracted Europe's finest minds, and author of the *Historiae sui temporis*, which earned him the title of 'father of modern history' in his lifetime. His standing has declined since then, with many scholars treating his *Historiae* as a primary source to be pillaged for anecdotes and historical evidence, but during his lifetime he was regarded primarily as a man of real influence. Indeed he became a high-ranking magistrate and politician in the second half of the 1580s, well before the first volume of his *Historiae sui temporis* was published (late 1603), so that he was many things in turn: historian, president, poet, patron, and peace-maker. De Smet's goal is to investigate how he constructed his personality as both magistrate and intellectual in the tumultuous times in which he lived.

De Thou left an autobiography, the *Commentarii de sua vita*, but like every other such work, these so-called *Memoirs* are a part of this process of self-construction, not an objective analysis of it. De Smet therefore turns to the

full variety of sources about de Thou and his life, producing not a chronologically ordered continuous narrative, but a thematic study designed to shed light on important points. Chapter One focuses around the theme of *réécriture*, especially de Thou's use of poetry to project a carefully fashioned public and literary *persona*. Chapter Two uses his poetry and correspondence to show how he operated on the national and international scenes as both a writer and an officer of the French state, worthy to stand alongside Scaliger, Lipsius, and Casaubon. Chapter Three turns to the women in de Thou's life, both real and fictional, to show how they helped him shape his role in society, through marital politics, the poetry of love and mourning, and childbirth. Chapter Four focuses on the role of books and reading in de Thou's development and on his pursuit of knowledge in relation to both the political backdrop of the day and his network of educational and literary friendships. Chapter Five turns to the *Historiae*, not in order to provide a comprehensive analysis, but to anchor his *magnum opus* in his life world, where it contributed to defining his role on the national and international stages. The conclusion outlines de Thou's fall from favor, years that are not covered in his autobiography but that contribute nonetheless to the refining, then the shattering, of his public image.

The picture that emerges is complex. Throughout his life de Thou's self-construction remained embedded in his family and their web of alliances, in political circles, and in the world of scholarship in his day. He thought of himself as an inadequate courtier and a reluctant public servant, but as a loyal subject of France who wished only the best for his native land. He claimed that his basic values remained constant, but his friendships waxed and waned according to changes in his personal and political life. His dealings with Scaliger, Casaubon, and Lipsius gave him standing as a mediator in the Wars of Religion, but became a liability in the more rigorously Catholic environment that developed after the arrival of Marie de Médicis. The result is a conflicted psyche whose panoply of values included prudence, the ability to adapt to changing circumstances, but which remained unified and stable over time–a marked contrast to Montaigne's fragmented and multiple depictions of himself ("Si je parle diversement de moi, c'est que je me regarde diversement").

De Smet's is not the first, or the only, treatment of de Thou in modern times: she acknowledges generously her debt to Samuel Kinser's fundamental study, *The Works of Jacques-Auguste de Thou* (The Hague, 1966). Scholarly fashions change, however, and De Smet's study is very much of our day, bringing

the concerns of scholarship at the beginning of the twenty-first century to one of the more intriguing figures of neo-Latin letters. Solidly based in unpublished material and primary sources, this is an engaging study that can provide a good model for how other figures in humanist scholarship can be treated. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

♦ *Natale Conti's Mythologiae*. Trans. and annotated by John Mulryan and Steven Brown. 2 vols. Medieval and Renaissance Texts and Studies, 316. Tempe, Arizona: Arizona Center for Medieval and Renaissance Studies, 2006. xlvi + 978 pp. $110. The *Mythologiae* of Natale Conti (1520-1582) was influential during the Renaissance, going through at least twenty-one editions in Latin and six in French, early enough to influence Spenser's *Shepheardes Calendar* and late enough to influence Milton as he began *Paradise Lost*. Yet there is no modern edition of the Latin text or of the seventeenth-century French translation, nor is there a complete English translation. Mulryan and Brown set out to provide an English translation, in an effort to make this major text in western intellectual history more accessible to modern readers.

Little is known of Conti's life. His minor works consist chiefly of translations from classical Greek into Latin and of his own imitations of Greek and Latin verse. These translations are generally direct and accurate, but are nowhere near as ambitious as the *Mythologiae*, which attempted to extract a code of conduct from Greek and Latin myth that would be applicable in Conti's day as well. As mythography, both a compilation and an interpretation of myth, the *Mythologiae* joins a tradition that ranges from Fulgentius, the Vatican mythographers, and Boccaccio to Giraldi, Pomey, Alexander ab Alexandro, and Cartari. Although the immorality of pagan myth gives him occasional pause, Conti justifies its study on ethical and intellectual grounds: "We intend to gloss only those stories that raise men to the heights of celestial knowledge, that counsel proper behavior and discourage unlawful pleasures, that reveal nature's secrets, that ultimately teach us all we absolutely need to know to lead a decent human life, that enhance our understanding of the great writers" (1.1). The organization in turn is straightforward: the introductory chapters outline Conti's philosophy of myth and interpretive schemata, books two through nine present Christianizations of the myths, and the concluding tenth book serves as an epitome of what has gone before.

The translation reads well, neither overly formal nor excessively collo-

quial; this section is typical: "Just to cut short this discussion of such futile enterprises, which I know for a fact have brought nothing but pain and misfortune to the cash boxes of many people, and will certainly continue to do so in the future, suffice it to say that many men have interpreted these myths as a way of rationalizing their own designs" (135). The thirty-five-page introduction, which is well annotated and clearly written, provides an introduction to Conti's life and works and to the *Mythologiae*; there is also an appendix that discusses key editions and a detailed index. One can, of course, quibble a bit. The introduction, for example, now and again presses a bit too vigorously in support of Conti, as sometimes happens when scholars devote many years of work to one subject. It would also have been nice, given the lack of a modern critical edition, to have had Latin text and English translation on facing pages, although this would have doubled the size of an already-substantial set of books. Nonetheless this edition meets its stated goal, to make the *Mythologiae* accessible once again to a broad audience, well. (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)

◆ *Justi Lipsi Epistolae, pars XIV: 1601.* Ed. by Jeanine De Landtsheer. Brussels: Vlaamse Academie van België voor Wetenschappen en Kunsten, 2006. 591 pp. 97.60 euros. In 1601 the Augsburg humanist Marcus Welser encouraged Lipsius to publish more of his letters. "Do you really think they are worth it?" Lipsius replied. He continued that they were not very important, but concluded, "I will nevertheless obey you" (01 08 16). And he would soon send Welser a *Centuria*, a hundred letters to German and French scholars. Needless to say, this *Centuria* was already in an advanced state when Lipsius feigned his submission to Welser's opinion. Such professions of modesty followed the rules of epistolary rhetoric, although this letter to Welser itself was not included among the letters which Lipsius published during his lifetime. ILE XIV contains many of the letters he did publish, lavishly quoting from Horace and above all from Statius's *Sylvae*. They are full of good advice, moral lectures (e.g., 01 02 27), Stoic *sententiae* (a beautiful one in 01 04 01 (?) [sic] B, ll. 16-18), and complaints about the state of affairs in Flanders, where much of the Dutch revolt was carried out. They carry the hallmark of Lipsius' style: the reader stumbles over short rhetorical questions (01 09 24) and over the staccato of his sentences: pronouns linked together with the verbs omitted, sometimes almost to the point of defying grammatical rules

(01 09 23, ll. 8-9). Occasionally his style is copied by his correspondents (e.g., 01 01 14).

Lipsius's strategy of self-fashioning is unmasked in ILE. The chronological juxtaposition of all remaining letters, irrespective of their original purposes and addressees, uncovers the rough path which he himself smooths so carefully in his printed collections. The uniformity of a modern edition can be deceptive: at first sight it tends to obscure the variety of forms and purposes the letters had. But a modern edition also brings to light that Lipsius, naturally, presented different faces to different correspondents. From matter-of-fact scrawls about finances to the carefully crafted letters from his *Centuriae* (styled *cottidianas Epistolas* by Lipsius himself in 01 02 20 Z, some of which were perhaps never sent in the form they were printed), these letter collections also show how he built his alliances, trying to be friends with everyone, from the Protestant Scaliger, whom he respected (the respect was not quite mutual), to Scaliger's despised opponent Martín del Rio. Lipsius was extremely skilled in navigating between Scylla and Charybdis. Another way of putting it is that he was anxious to avoid conflicts and was interested primarily in his own fame.

The letters give insights into the preoccupations of Lipsius and his correspondents: numerous deaths, but also the wedding of his servant Anna, the siege of Ostende, the aftermath of the Savoy War, and the situation at Europe's eastern border. They speak about anti-Semitism in Poland (01 01 04) and Lipsius' sexism (01 12 27 M; n. 3: "Nicolas" should be "Daniel"), but also voice his support for a pregnant teenager abandoned by "her boyfriend" (01 10 13 S). The correspondence with Balthasar Moretus gives detailed insight into the genesis of Lipsius' works (and stands out from other letters for its lack of rhetorical amplification), and in her annotations De Landtsheer proves to be intimately familiar with the archive of the Museum Plantin-Moretus (e.g., p. 233). A fascinating letter in which Lipsius looks for historical precedents of extreme drought (it had hardly rained for six months) could be of interest even today for the history of global warming. Of course Lipsius writes many a letter of recommendation, and people write to him recommending themselves (*Qui sim, quaeris?* 01 09 01). One Fitzherbert forgets all about *brevitas* in his long and rhetorical letter (note the alliterations in ll. 141-42). A liminary poem is even included, on the assumption that it accompanied a now-lost letter ([01 11 02] P^2).

The synopses of the primarily Latin letters (there are some in Greek,

French, Italian, and Dutch) are extremely helpful and have the advantage over translations more quickly digested by readers who have little patience with laborious rhetoric, even in translation. The footnotes contain more information than one would dare to ask from an editor (and sometimes more than is relevant, e.g., 01 01 21 H, ad 22; or 01 01 31 W, ad 22-24), especially where it concerns political news (e.g., 01 01 06; 01 07 02, ad 17). They often refer to unpublished letters of others, or otherwise not easily accessible (manuscript) sources, to clarify issues (e.g., 01 01 24, ad 12). The quality of the English is high, better, in my opinion, than in that of previous volumes which have appeared in English (the series is in Dutch up to vol. VII). Gerlo and Vervliet's *Inventaire* of Lipsius' correspondence (1968) is corrected on so many points that I have decided not to consult it anymore for the years up to 1595 and 1600-1601.

There remain, however, some drawbacks, for which De Landtsheer cannot be held accountable. When the project began three decades ago, certain conventions were established that I do not think are ideal but that are to be be maintained for all nineteen volumes. There are no paragraph divisions in the texts of the edited letters; capitals and italics are maintained as they appear in the original editions or even as in the manuscripts; abbreviations, even the most common ones, are always resolved between brackets, which (especially in the formulaic salutations and valedictions) appear a bit messy to the eyes; the letters are numbered but (cross-) reference to these numbers is never made; the sigla are not always convenient codes for the sources, combining bold, roman, subscript, and Greek fonts; and the Greek in the text body of the letters is printed in italics for no particular reason. Fidelity to source texts leads to not separating *revera* (395, l. 6), which could be supported; but *iamante* looks odd (76, l. 25; 268, l. 10; 466, l. 10, but not so on 550, l. 11), and so does *iamnunc* (413, l. 4). Classical sources are referred to with an economy that is puzzling even for classicists (189, ad 25: "Ar. *Fr*. 31"–is this Aristophanes' *Frogs* or *Fragments*?). 01 06 22 V is fictitious, we learn, but the fictitious letters from Lipsius' 1577 *Epistolicae quaestiones* were not included in ILE I (cf. ILE XIV, p. 269, ad 12), maybe because they lack a date?

De Landtsheer's accuracy is phenomenal. Considering the variety of source material, one is bound to come across transcription mistakes. But De Landtsheer's diligence made it a challenge to spot them. I take pride in having found three mistakes in the Latin (248, l. 3: pro *patrocionio*, lege *patrocinio*; p. 369,

ll. 30-31, pro *ad diem VI Kal[endas] Aprilium*, lege *ad diem VI Kal[endarum] Aprilium*; cf. the next line, *Kal[endas] (Apriles)*; p. 462, l. 44: pro *ille*, lege *illi*). The minor observations that follow now carry little weight in comparison with the excellent job De Landtsheer has done. The copious use of exclamation marks should be avoided. Neologisms could have been identified with more consistency: *dissertatiuncula* (439, l. 3, with a reference to Hoven's *Lexique*) hardly defies understanding, but in the annotation to a letter, obviously not written by Lipsius, which within six lines has the words *verbotenus, plataforma, mosqueta*, and *locumtenens*, only *plataforma* is identified as non-classical, this time without reference to Hoven's lexicon (01 01 23, ll. 15-21), although only *locumtenens* is in Hoven (ed. 1994; 2006). The non-classical *capis me*, for "you understand me," is also not commented on (01 10 31 P). In the synopses those things made explicit which in the letters are only implicit are sometimes put between square brackets, sometimes not (compare [00] 01 29 W, "[at Nieuwpoort]" with 01 01 14, "Josephus Justus Scaliger"). Instead of speaking of Oldenbarnevelt's "obstinacy," I would have chosen a more neutral expression, like "refusal" (one could even argue, in Lipsian terms, for Oldenbarnevelt's "constancy"). In addition I counted in the head notes, annotations, and critical apparatus less than fifty instances of insignificant mistakes in spelling and punctuation (mostly in the English) and absences of source references. But in a book of almost 600 pages these inevitable lapses are hardly noticed in the *cornu copiae* of what will remain the definitive edition of Lipsius' letters. (Dirk van Miert, The Warburg Institute, London)

◆ *On The Donation of Constantine*. By Lorenzo Valla. Trans. by G. W. Bowersock. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 24. xvi + 206 pp. *Baldo*, vol. 1: Books I-XII. By Teofilo Folengo. Trans. by Ann E. Mullaney. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 25. xxiv + 471 pp. *Ciceronian Controversies*. Ed. by Joann Dellaneva. Trans. by Brian Duvick. The I Tatti Renaissance Library, 26. xl + 295 pp. Cambridge, Mass. and London: Harvard University Press, 2007. $29.95 per volume. The three volumes reviewed here constitute the 2007 installment in the I Tatti Renaissance Library; as such, they represent well the diversity and quality of the series. *On the Donation of Constantine* is a work of great seriousness which won for its author a reputation for philological brilliance and (ultimately) a place on the Index. As Valla shows, the Donation of Constantine, which justified the claims of the Papacy to political authority

over the western Mediterranean, cannot be what it purports to be. Valla was not the first to question its legitimacy–Nicholas of Cusa, for example, beat him to it–but the grounds of his attack were new: Valla challenged the treatise first rhetorically, arguing that there was no reason for Constantine to have given away half his empire, then philologically, showing that on the basis of its language and style, the treatise could not have been written by Constantine. Initially there were no signs of outrage from the Papacy–indeed Valla was named apostolic *scriptor*, then papal secretary, after writing the treatise–but the work became much more incendiary after the Reformation, finally appearing on the Index in 1559, more than a hundred years after it was written. But Valla was right, as the subscription at the end shows, for Constantine and Gallicanus never served as consuls together, as the subscription says they did.

Folengo's *Baldo* is a horse of a totally different color. It is ostensibly an epic in the romance tradition of Pulci and Ariosto by one Merlin Cocaio. The author was actually Teofilo Folengo, a Benedictine monk who lived from 1491 to 1544 and wrote a variety of other works ranging from sacred literature to the *Chaos del Triperuno*, a remarkable self-exploration in Latin, Italian, and macaronics. This linguistic dexterity is also the key feature of the *Baldo*, for which style is everything. There is a plot based around the exploits of the poem's eponymous hero, but much of the humor–the poem is very funny indeed–is linguistic. Nearly every hexameter contains a humorous word like *sledammaverat*, "had taken the crap out [of his eyes]," from *ex* and *laetamen*, "manure." Lines like *Quo fugis? Unde venis? Quis te facit ire galoppum* are typical, with the vaguely Virgilian beginning leading to the thud of the non-Latinate *galoppum*. I generally do not comment on the translations in volumes in this series beyond noting that they are uniformly accurate and readable, but more must be said here: I simply cannot imagine trying to reproduce Folengo's macaronics in English. Here is the first sentence of the poem: *Dudum, Serinissime comes, adeo meum imbalordasti cervellum ut tibi de retrovatione huius voluminis aliquid scribere, quod de memoriae cadastris quasi mattus caschaverim, et ne tantum mihi prebeas amplius impazzum, accipe rem non quam audivi sed his manibus pertocavi*. Now, after trying to translate this yourself, consider Mullaney's rendering: "Oh most illustrious magnate, you have been driving me nuts asking me to tell you about the discovery of this book, so that I have almost fallen mad from the annals of my memory, and so that you don't make me even crazier, here's the story that I did not simply hear but experienced firsthand." Reading over two

hundred pages of this is one thing, but producing a printable, precise translation is quite another–and there is a second volume to come.

Dellaneva and Duvick's *Ciceronian Controversies* in turn offers the major texts from one of the great arguments in Renaissance culture, the one about how a proper Latin style should be developed. As the controversy developed, positions were nuanced and compromises devised, but the debate in general was over whether Cicero should serve as the model for a revived classical Latin or whether a more eclectic approach was preferable. Round one involved an exchange of letters between the Roman humanist Paolo Cortesi (1465-1510) and Angelo Poliziano (1454-1494); round two, between Gianfrancesco Pico della Mirandola (*ca.* 1469-1533) and Pietro Bembo (1470-1547); and round three, between Giambattista Giraldi Cinzio (1504-1573) and Celio Calcagnini (1479-1541). Also included are extracts from two works of Antonio Possevino that comment on the debate. Other figures entered in, so that early on one line links Vergerio, George of Trebizond, Bruni, Poggio, and Guarino as Ciceronians and another links Barzizza, Alberti, Salutati, and Valla as eclectics. Geography also matters: the real home of Ciceronianism was Rome, whose humanists saw themselves as the descendants of the great Roman writers in ways that humanists of other cities could not. This quarrel matters, both in and of itself and for its connections to the broader *questione della lingua*, the educational theory of the day, and the religious turmoil that characterized the later Renaissance; it is therefore valuable to have the key texts brought together in one place.

As is usual with this series, the texts rely on critical editions established by others and the notes are minimal, what is necessary for an informed first reading. Everything is done to a uniformly high standard, and it is worth pausing for a moment to note that there are now more than twenty-five volumes in this series. That this milestone was reached in only seven years is a remarkable accomplishment, a tribute in particular to the general editor, James Hankins, whose work for the series was honored by a conference, 'Thrice-Born Latinity,' held at UCLA in November of 2007. (The proceedings of this conference will be published, then reviewed in NLN.) (Craig Kallendorf, Texas A&M University)